

The contribution to the perihelion advance of Mercury arising out of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential

Harihar Behera*

Department of Physics, Utkal University, Vanivihar, Bhubaneswer-751004, Orissa, India

Abstract

The effect of general relativistic prediction of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential on the dynamics of a planet moving around the sun is shown to have a negative contribution of $14 \cdot 326$ arcsec/century towards the overall non-Newtonian perihelion advance of Mercury.

PACS: 04.80Cc ; 04.25Nx

Keywords : *Potential dependence of mass , Perihelion Advance of Mercury.*

*email: harihar@iopb.res.in

1 Introduction

The general relativistic effect of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential [1, 2] taken in conjunction with the Schwarzschild metric has got the virtue of addressing [1] from a single point of view four effects, viz.,

- (a) the gravitational red-shift of photons flying away from a gravitating body,
- (b) the increase of energy difference between levels in atoms with the increase of their distance from the gravitating body,
- (c) the retardation of radar echo from planets,
- (d) the deflection of star light observed during a solar eclipse,

which are usually discussed separately in the literature. But if one wishes to see the effect of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential on the dynamics of a planet moving around the sun, then a negative contribution of $14 \cdot 326$ arcsec/century towards the overall non-Newtonian perihelion advance of Mercury seems inevitable which deserves attention in the standard general relativistic explanation for the observed anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury.

2 Perihelion Advance from Schwarzschild Solution

The standard general relativistic explanation for the observed non-Newtonian perihelion advance of a planet's orbit may be obtained from the so-called Schwarzschild spherically symmetric solution of Einstein's field equations corresponding to an additional Hamiltonian in the bound Kepler problem [3] of the form :

$$\Delta H = -\frac{h_E}{r^3} \quad (1)$$

with

$$h_E = \frac{kl^2}{m^2c^2}, \quad k = GM_\odot m \quad (2)$$

where l , m represent the angular momentum and mass of the planet respectively, $M_\odot$ is the solar mass, G is Newton's Universal gravitational constant; r is the distance between the Sun and the planet and c is the speed of light in vacuum.

Thus the potential energy after the correction (1) is

$$U = -\frac{k}{r} - \frac{h_E}{r^3} \quad (3)$$

It is known [3] that if a potential with $1/r^3$ form is added to a central force perturbation of the bound Kepler problem, the orbit in the bound problem is an ellipse in a rotating

coordinate system. In effect the ellipse rotates, and the periapsis appears to precess. If the perturbation Hamiltonian is (1), then it predicts [3] a precession of the perihelion of a planet at an average rate of

$$\dot{\omega} = \frac{6\pi k m^2 h_E}{\tau l^4} \quad (4)$$

where τ is the classical period of revolution of the planet around the sun. With $l^2 = GM_\odot m^2 a (1 - e^2)$ and $h_E = \frac{GM_\odot l^2}{mc^2}$, the expression (4) represents Einstein's expression for the non-Newtonian perihelion advance of a planet's orbit [3]:

$$\dot{\omega}_E = \frac{6\pi k^2}{\tau l^2 c^2} = \frac{6\pi GM_\odot}{\tau c^2 a (1 - e^2)} \quad (5)$$

where the symbols have their usual meanings.

3 Contribution to the perihelion advance of Mercury arising out of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential

One of the predictions of general relativity is that the rest energy E_0 of any massive object increases with increase of the distance from the gravitating body because of the increase of the potential ϕ [1, 2]:

$$E_0 = mc^2 \left(1 + \frac{\phi}{c^2} \right) \quad (6)$$

The gravitational potential is

$$\phi = -\frac{GM_\odot}{r} \quad (7)$$

where the symbols have their usual meanings. Because of the relations $E = mc^2$ and (6) – (7), the gravitationally modified mass of a planet in the gravitational field of the sun may be expressed as

$$m^\star = m \left(1 - \frac{GM_\odot}{c^2 r} \right) \quad (8)$$

If we wish to see the effect of (8) on the dynamics of a planet moving around the sun, then instead of (3) we should consider an equation of the form :

$$U^\star = -\frac{k^\star}{r} - \frac{h_E^\star}{r^3} \quad (9)$$

where

$$k^* = GM_\odot m^* = k \left(1 - \frac{GM_\odot}{c^2 r} \right), \text{ and } h_E^* = h_E \quad (10)$$

since $h_E = \frac{(GM_\odot)^2 a(1-e^2)}{c^2}$ is independent of the mass of the planet. Therefore (9) may be rewritten as

$$U^* = -\frac{k}{r} - \frac{h}{r^2} - \frac{h_E}{r^3} \quad (11)$$

where

$$h = -\frac{kGM_\odot}{c^2} \quad (12)$$

It is now apparent from (11) that the consideration of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential introduced an additional Hamiltonian of the form $\frac{1}{r^2}$ into the equation (3). In consequence of this effect, a new contribution towards the overall non-Newtonian perihelion advance of a planet's orbit may be estimated [3] at

$$\dot{\omega}_{new} = \frac{2\pi m h}{\tau l^2} = -\frac{2\pi GM_\odot}{\tau c^2 a(1-e^2)} = -\frac{\dot{\omega}_E}{3} \quad (13)$$

For Mercury, the value of $\dot{\omega}_E = 42 \cdot 98$ arcsec/century - a well known data [4, 5, 6]. So $\dot{\omega}_{new} = -14 \cdot 326$ arcsec/century, for Mercury. This is in no way a negligible contribution.

4 Discussion

The Modern observational value of the anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury is at $\dot{\omega} \approx 43''$ per century [6]. For Mercury, General Relativity predicts this phenomenon at

$$\dot{\omega}_{GR} = \left[42 \cdot 98'' + 1 \cdot 289''(J_{2\odot}/10^{-5}) \right] \text{ per century}, \quad (14)$$

where $J_{2\odot}$ is the magnitude of solar quadrupole moment of the sun - a definite value of which has still to be determined [4]. Although the Solar quadrupole moment contribution is a Newtonian contribution, it was taken account of because it was not there in the standard expression. It is to be noted that the standard explanation for the perihelion advance of Mercury offered by (14) does not include the contribution arising out of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential discussed here. But if one takes this effect into account, then (14) taken in conjunction with (13) is not in agreement with the observed perihelion advance of Mercury. However, as a remedy for this disagreement one may suggest a value of $J_{2\odot}$ at

$$J_{2\odot} \approx 1 \cdot 11 \times 10^{-4} \quad (15)$$

Unfortunately, such a suggestion is not in agreement with none of the existing observational data on $J_{2\odot}$. For example, Dicke and Goldenberg's [7] optical measurements of the solar oblateness showed $J_{2\odot} \simeq (2 \cdot 5 \pm 0 \cdot 2) \times 10^{-5}$. It is to be noted that Dicke and Goldenberg's measured value of $J_{2\odot}$ makes the observations of the perihelion advance of Mercury disagree with the predictions of General Relativity [4]. In 1974, Hill et.al., [8], by measuring Sun's optical oblateness, obtained $J_{2\odot} \simeq (0 \cdot 1 \pm 0 \cdot 4) \times 10^{-5}$. The values of $J_{2\odot}$ much smaller than the above cited values have also been measured by others (for references see for example [4]). From these considerations, the suggested value of $J_{2\odot}$ in (15) is unacceptable. In this scenario, the effect of the dependence of mass on gravitational potential seems to make a point of concern for the standard general relativistic explanation for the observed anomalous perihelion advance of Mercury in particular and other planets in general which merits further study.

Acknowledgments

The author is indebted to Prof. N. Barik and Prof. L. P. Singh of Utkal University, Vanivihar, Bhubaneswer for fruitful discussion and valuable suggestions. The author also acknowledges the help received from Institute of Physics, Bhubaneswar for using its Library and Computer Centre for this work.

References

- [1] L. B. Okun, Mod. Phys. Lett. A, Vol15, No.31(2000)1941-1947.
- [2] L. B. Okun, K. G. Selivanov, V. L. Telegdi, Am. J. Phys. 68(2)(2000)115-119.
- [3] H. Goldstein, *Classical Mechanics*, 2nd Ed.(Narosa Publishing House, New Delhi, 1995)509-512.
- [4] I. Ciufolini and J. A. Wheeler, *Gravitation and Inertia* (Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1995).
- [5] C. M. Will, *Theory and Experiment in Gravitational Physics*, 2nd Ed. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1993).
- [6] C. M. Will, "The confrontation between General Relativity and Experiment", *Living Rev. Relativity*, 4, (2001), 4. [Online Article] : cited on <11May2001>, <http://www.livingreviews.org/Articles/Volume4/2001-4will/>.

- [7] R. Dicke and H. Goldenberg, The oblateness of the Sun, *Astrophys. J. Suppl.* 27 (1974)131-82.
- [8] H. A. Hill et. al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 33 (1974)1497-1500.